PUBLIC WORKSHOP

Agricultural Water Use Efficiency 2015 Grants Draft Funding Awards





August 30, 2016 — Sacramento Webinar

Conference Line: 1 (877) 952-3588

Passcode: 590 225 6



Purpose of Workshop

- Present draft funding recommendations for the 2015 Agricultural Water Use Efficiency Proposal Solicitation
- Provide information on next steps leading to the execution of grant agreements



Solicited Projects

– Section A (Implementation Projects):

Agricultural water use efficiency projects and programs that create <u>measurable</u> water conservation or water use efficiency benefits.

– Section B (Other Projects):

Agricultural water use efficiency projects and programs that have the <u>potential to create measurable</u> water conservation or water use efficiency benefits.

- Technical Assistance
- Planning, Feasibility Studies and Pilot Projects
- Research and Development
- Training, Education, and Public Outreach



Project Priority

- Are not locally cost-effective
- Provides the most state benefits per grant dollar
- Focuses primarily on service to disadvantaged communities or economically distressed areas
- Employs a regional scope of activities
- Employs new or innovative technologies or practices
- Leverages private, federal or local funding to produce the greatest state level public benefit
- Improves irrigation water management to conserve water or to reduce the quantity of highly saline or toxic drainage water



Project Priority (cont.)

- Provides water metering and/or volumetric pricing for agricultural water suppliers serving less than 25,000 irrigated acres
- Implements Agricultural Water Management Plan (AWMP) actions for agricultural water suppliers that supply water to 10,000 to 25,000 acres of land
- Produces multiple benefits such as improved water quality, stream flow timing and quantity, and local water supply reliability
- Conserves energy and helps the GHG emission reduction or carbon sequestration goals in implementation



Proposals Received

#	Project Category	Grant Requested	Total Projects Cost
13	A1 - Implementation: Modernization/Automation /Other Projects	\$12,261,085	\$24,192,800
10	A2 – Implementation: Capital Outlay Projects	\$18,698,663	\$41,475,438
11	B1 - R&D/Feasibilities/Pilots/Demos	\$2,212,714	\$4,225,134
16	B2 - Training/Education/Outreach	\$4,069,542	\$7,321,590
50	Total	\$37,242,004	\$77,214,962

^{*}Three applications were determined to be ineligible during the screening phase.





Review Panels

Panel A1 – (5 reviewers)

Section A (Implementation: Modernization/Automation/Other) Proposals

Panel A2 – (4 reviewers)

Section A (Capital Outlay) Proposals

Panel B1 – (4 reviewers)

Section B (R&D/Feasibilities/Pilots/Demos) Proposals

Panel B2 – (6 reviewers)

Section B (Training/Education/Outreach) Proposals





Review Process

All reviewers are subject to State conflict of interest laws

- All reviewers signed a Non-Conflict of Interest Form
- Reviewers have independently evaluated proposals according to the criteria established in the PSP
- Each panel discussed individual scores and came up with consensus scores and ranking





Relevance & Consistency with PSP - 30 points

- 1. How well does the project or the information gained or disseminated by the project address the funding priorities of the PSP and Proposition 1 goals? Has the applicant sufficiently demonstrated an agricultural water use efficiency benefit?
- 2. Does the project directly achieve or is it designed to facilitate water supplier or on-farm water use efficiencies?
- 3. Is the project NOT locally cost-effective?
- 4. Regional scope Is the project consistent with regional or local water management plans? Will this project employ a regional collaborative scope of activities and improve regional water self-reliance?
- 5. Does the project improve irrigation water management to conserve water or reduce the quantity of highly saline or toxic drainage water?

Relevance & Consistency with PSP - 30 points (cont.)

- 6. Does the project provide water metering and/or volumetric pricing for agricultural water suppliers serving less than 25,000 irrigated acres?
- 7. Does the proposal leverage private, federal, or local funding to produce the greatest state level public benefit?
- 8. Innovation and Use of BAT Does the project offer a new technology, method, or system that has not yet been tested in California, implement Best Available Technology, or otherwise use existing technology in an innovative manner?
- 9. DAC/EDA Does the project involve or provide direct benefits from the grant to a disadvantaged community or economically distressed area?
- 10. Energy / GHG reduction Relative to the project's water components, will this project reduce energy demand? How will implementation reduce GHG production?

Feasibility - 25 points

- 1. Technical and Scientific Merit Does the project have adequate feasibility and technical merit? Do the approach, methods and procedures used satisfy the project's SMART objectives?
- 2. Outreach, Community Involvement, and Acceptance Has the applicant coordinated with local organizations and provided demonstrated support? Is the project ready to proceed?
- 3. Qualifications of the Applicants and Cooperators Are the applicant and cooperators qualified? Will the applicant be able to provide for the management and control of project benefits?
- 4. Based on the proposal's statement of work and project description, how likely will the quantity of benefits estimated in the proposal be achieved?



Project Benefits - 20 points

- 1. Quantity of Benefits Will the project or information provide significant state and/or local benefits after project is implemented? (e.g., quantity of water saved).
- 2. Multiple benefits How well does the project provide multiple benefits? Water savings, water quality, environmental and/or energy savings / GHG emissions reduction.



Project Costs - 15 points

- 1. Are costs reasonable?
- 2. How does State cost to State benefits compare to other proposals?
- 3. Local Cost Effectiveness and Local Cost Share- How accurately were the local monetary benefits estimated? How closely has the applicant matched the project's local cost share to the local monetary benefit?



Monitoring and Evaluation – 10 points

Verification of Project Results –

- □ Does the proposal clearly identify the project SMART objectives?
- □ Is the monitoring and performance plan complete (e.g., procedures for baseline information, performance metrics, identification of output and outcome indicators, etc.)?
- □ Will the performance metrics allow for verification of anticipated project results and benefits?



Summary of Recommended Grant Awards

Project Category	Number of Funded Projects / Total Projects	Awarded Projects Total Cost	Local Cost-Share	Awarded Grants	
Section A1 Modernization/Automation/ Other Projects	9/13	\$ 20,963,173	\$10,790,735	\$10,172,438	
Section A2 Capital Outlay Projects 7/10		\$30,575,993	\$16,220,021	\$14,355,972	
Section B1 R&D, Feasibilities, Pilots, and Demonstration Projects	9/11	\$3,728,353	\$1,922,099	\$1,806,254	
Section B2 Technical Assistance, Training, Education, and Outreach Projects		\$6,715,248 \$3,252,048		\$3,463,200	
Total	38/50	\$61,982,767	\$32,184,903	\$29,797,864	

Distribution of Funds

Project Type	Available Funding	Proposed Awards	
Section A –			
Implementation Projects	\$27,000,000	\$24,528,410	
Section B –			
Research and Development Feasibility Studies	\$3,000,000	\$5,269,454	
Pilot or Demonstration Projects			
Training, Education, or Public Outreach Programs			
Technical Assistance Programs			

Total Funds: \$30 million
*left over: \$202,136
14.8% going towards DAC/EDAs





Section A1 Proposals Ranking and Draft Grant Awards

Score	Applicant	Proposal Number	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Requested Funding	Proposed Grant Award	Remarks
83.2	Reclamation District 108	2015WUE0023	Distribution System Improvements	\$3,000,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	
81.8	Willow Creek Mutual Water Company	2015WUE0019	Irrigation Water Improvement on Willow Creek Ranch	\$360,545	\$155,783	\$155,783	
81.4	Sutter Extension Water District	2015WUE0022	Looney Weir Modernization Project	\$669,809	\$333,250	\$333,250	
74.6	Richvale Irrigation District	2015WUE0033	Phase I Infrastructure Modernization	\$1,496,638	\$748,319	\$748,319	
74.6	Placer County Water Agency	2015WUE0021	Antelope Canal Automation	\$694,414	\$346,616	\$346,616	
74.6	Oakdale Irrigation District	2015WUE0043	Phase I Total Channel Control System Modernization	\$6,510,367	\$2,972,770	\$2,972,770	
74.0	United Water Conservation District	2015WUE0016	Installation of a SCADA Integrated Metering System at Turnouts of the Pumping-Trough-Pipeline System	\$1,270,118	\$635,059	\$635,059	
74.0	Biggs-West Gridley Water District	2015WUE0038	Infrastructure Modernization and Canal Operations Decision Support	\$2,963,348	\$1,481,674	\$1,481,674	Project expanded at DWR's request for grantee to fully implement their measurement program (initial proposed project total: \$1,494,622).
71.2	Rancho California Water District	2015WUE0005	Agricultural Crop Conversions Program	\$3,997,934	\$1,998,967	\$1,998,967	
62.2	Ventura County Resource Conservation District	2015WUE0018	Implementing Efficient Water Management Practices on Agricultural Properties in Ventura County	\$1,576,450	\$866,450	-	Not Selected for Funding (score < 70)
51.0	Reclamation District 2035	2015WUE0047	Canal Automation and Farm-Gate Measurement Project	\$861,960	\$430,980	-	Not Selected for Funding (score < 70)
-	Rainbow Municipal Water District	2015WUE0048	Advanced Metering Infrastructure For Agricultural Use	\$625,000	\$625,000	-	Ineligible application (cost share requirements not addressed)
	18th District Agricultural Association/ Eastern Sierra Tri-County Fairgrounds	2015WUE00XX	Extensive Water Savings at the 18th District Agricultural Association/ Eastern Sierra Tri-County Fairgrounds	\$166,217	\$166,217	-	Proposed project is ineligible
			Total	\$24,192,800	\$12,261,085	\$10,172,438	

Section A2 Proposals Ranking and Draft Grant Awards

Score	Applicant	Proposal Number	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Requested Funding	Proposed Grant Award	Remarks
84.5	California Trout	2015WUE0015	Hidden Valley Ranch Efficiency and Cold Water Exchange Project	\$418,800	\$323,614	\$323,614	
80.0	Buena Vista Water Storage District	2015WUE0024	Northern Area Pipeline- Southeast Extension	\$7,088,690	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	
75.8	Patterson Irrigation District	2015WUE0036	East-West Conveyance Project, Pumping Plant 2 & Closed Conveyance	\$5,889,340	\$2,934,670	\$2,934,670	
75.0	Natomas Central Mutual Water Company	2015WUE0028	NDC Lift Pump Station	\$1,674,000	\$837,000	\$837,000	
75.0	Cawelo Water District	2015WUE0032	Friant-Kern Canal & 8-23 Canal Intertie Pipeline	\$6,983,805	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	
71.5	Lower Tule River Irrigation District	2015WUE0008	Lower Tule River Irrigation District Riparian Area Distribution System	\$2,807,848	\$1,403,933	\$1,403,933	
70.5	North Kern Water Storage District	2015WUE0029	Calloway Canal Lining and Water Delivery Improvements	\$5,713,510	\$2,856,755	\$2,856,755	
66.5	Lindsay-Strathmore Irrigation District	2015WUE0027	Agricultural Water Conservation - Pipeline Replacement Project	\$6,226,000	\$2,988,600	-	Not Selected for Funding (Score < 70)
53.0	Pixley Irrigation District	2015WUE0011	Avenue 116 Canal Expansion Project	\$818,013	\$450,105	-	Not Selected for Funding (Score < 70)
	Tulare Irrigation District 2015WUE0007		Agricultural Conjunctive Use Water Conservation/Recharge Project	\$3,855,432	\$903,986	-	Proposed project is ineligible
			Total	\$41,475,438	\$18,698,663	\$14,355,972	

Section B1 Proposals Ranking and Draft Grant Awards

Total Project

Proposed

Proposal

Score	Applicant	Number	Project Title	Cost	Funding	Grant Award	Remarks
95.3	University of California Davis	2015WUE0 042	Optimizing Management of Subsurface Drip Irrigation in Alfalfa under full and deficit Irrigation Practices to Improve Water Use Efficiency	\$601,462	\$300,000	\$300,000	
95.0	Regents of the University of California	2015WUE0 030	Subsurface Drip Irrigation for Field Crops in California	\$586,003	\$292,853	\$292,853	
90.8	University of California Davis	2015WUE0 040	Increasing Water Use Efficiency and Drought Resilience in California Agriculture	\$600,466	\$299,969	\$299,969	
88.0	University Corporation at Monterey Bay	2015WUE0 044	Satellite-based IrriQuest calculator for monitoring crop consumptive use and quantifying efficiency metrics	\$565,724	\$282,862	\$282,862	
84.0	Cal Poly Corporation	2015WUE0 010	Optimizing Agricultural Water Use Efficiency: An Integrated Remote Monitoring System	\$71,657	\$35,801	\$35,801	
82.8	Placer County Water Agency	2015WUE0 045	Integration of Survey and Remote Sensing Tools for Identifying Opportunities for Water Use Efficiency Opportunities for Agricultural Water Users	\$195,084	\$97,542	\$97,542	
79.3	Alameda County Resource Conservation District	2015WUE0 025	Alameda County Carbon Farm Planning, Feasibility and Pilot Project	\$367,991	\$127,631	\$127,631	
74.3	University of California Davis	2015WUE0 031	Trustworthy web-based model for assessment and monitoring of agriculture water use in DAU Scale	\$212,946	\$106,473	\$106,473	
71.3	Sonoma Ecology Center	2015WUE0 039	Using Biochar to Save Water in California Agriculture	\$527,020	\$263,123	\$263,123	
65.5	Upper Salinas - Las Tablas RCD	2015WUE0 009	Central California Coast Ag Pond Conservation Initiative	\$196,781	\$106,460	-	Not Selected for Funding (Score < 70)
32.8	Turning Deserts Into Forests	2015WUE0 006	Water Efficiency Study Using Innovative Gelwater Irrigation Under No - Tillage and High Residue Field Conditions	\$300,000	\$300,000	-	Not Selected for Funding (Score < 70)
			Total	\$4,225,134	\$2,212,714	\$1,806,254	

Section B2 Proposals

70) Not Selected for

Funding (Score <

	Ranking and Draft Grant Awards									
Score	Applicant	Proposal Number	Project Title	Total Project Cost	Requested Funding	Proposed Grant Award	Remarks			
85.8	California Land Stewardship Institute	2015WUE0014	Increasing Water Use Efficiency in Northern California Wine Country – Napa, Sonoma and Mendocino Counties	\$600,000	\$300,000	\$300,000				
85.7	Tehama County Resource Conservation District	2015WUE0020	NSV Mobile Irrigation Lab	\$375,000	\$250,000	\$250,000				
78.7	RCD of Monterey County	2015WUE0046	On-Farm Spanish-language Irrigator Certification Training in Water Use Efficiency	\$556,932	\$296,368	\$296,368				
78.3	Kern Groundwater Authority	2015WUE0026	Remote Sensing Irrigation Efficiency Technical Assistance	\$425,250	\$212,625	\$212,625				
78.0	Vineyard Team	2015WUE0002	Improving Ag Water BMP Adoption and Creating a Culture of Conservation through Technical Assistance, Belief Modification, and Attitude Creation	\$653,941	\$299,935	\$299,935				
77.0	Regents of the University of California	2015WUE0035	Training and Extension Education for Irrigated Pastureland Enhancement	\$608,680	\$297,520	\$297,520				
77.0	Cal Poly Corporation	2015WUE0017	Technical Assistance to San Joaquin Valley Irrigation Districts	\$536,951	\$268,201	\$268,201				
76.8	Cal Poly Corporation	2015WUE0013	Technical Assistance to Sacramento Valley Irrigation Districts	\$617,383	\$294,945	\$294,945				
76.5	San Joaquin RCD	2015WUE0041	Improved Irrigation Management Through Airborne Crop Water Stress Detection	\$660,000	\$300,000	\$300,000				
75.8	Napa County Resource Conservation District	2015WUE0004	Building Improved Agricultural Water Use Efficiency in Napa County	\$275,937	\$137,682	\$137,682				
70.7	Semitropic Water Storage District	2015WUE0037	SWSD ET Remote Sensing Instrumentation and Comparison for Agricultural Water Use Efficiency	\$603,750	\$300,000	\$300,000				
70.2	California Rural Water Association	2015WUE0003a	Statewide Leak Detection Education and Technical Assistance Program	\$212,424	\$212,424	\$212,424				
70.0	CA Association of RCDs	2015WUE0034	Outreach Workshops, Technical Assistance and Irrigation Evaluations to the SWEEP Assistance Program	\$589,000	\$293,500	\$293,500				
63.3	California Rural Water Association	2015WUE0003c	Statewide EWMP & SB X7-7 Technical Assistance Program	\$214,650	\$214,650	-	Not Selected for Funding (Score < 70)			
62.8	Cal Poly Corporation	2015WUE0012	Technology Transfer to Areas Serving Disadvantaged Communities Agriculture	\$298,518	\$298,518	-	Not Selected for Funding (Score <			

Statewide EWMP & SB X7-7 Educational Program

Total

\$93,174

\$7,321,590

\$93,174

\$4,069,542

\$3,463,200

California Rural Water

Association

2015WUE0003b

47.5

Review and Selection Process

Applications Received (Deadline: 3/30/16)

Eligibility Review

Technical Review

Score and Rank Proposals (Consensus Review)

Conduct Public Workshop (Comments on Draft Funding Recommendations)

Final Funding Decision by DWR Director (Posted to DWR Website)

Contracting Process Begins



Agreement Requirements

- Standard Terms and Conditions
 - Specified by authorizing legislation and DWR policies and procedures
 - Work on project prior to final execution of agreement is at Applicant's own risk:
 - Costs incurred after award but before agreement signing can be considered as cost share at DWR's discretion
 - Costs incurred BEFORE award are not eligible
- SOW, Tasks, Timeline, and Budget.



Agreement Requirements cont.

Cost-Share Commitment Letter

- Institutional cost-sharing agreement signed by an authorized official, or
- In-kind contribution signed by authorized third party official

Signed Resolution

From governing board accepting funds and designating a representative

Audited Financial Statements

Submit the most recent three years of audited financial statements to demonstrate availability of sufficient funds to complete each project

Agreement Requirements cont.

Reports

- Quarterly fiscal and programmatic reports
- Comprehensive Final Report
- Section A: annual benefit and cost reports for 5 years after completion encouraged
- All information under contract is public

Compliance with Applicable Laws and Regulations

- Ag Water Measurements Regulation (CCR 597 et seq.)
- SBX7-7: Efficient Water Management Practices (EWMPs),
 Ag Water Management Plan (AWMP)
- Labor Code Compliance
- Intellectual and Proprietary Rights
- Environmental Documentation

Questions / Comments

Comments Deadline: 9/14/2016 5pm

- Department of Water Resources
 Water Use and Efficiency Branch
 Attn: Fethi BenJemaa
 901 P Street, Third Floor
 Sacramento, California 95814
- Email: WUEgrants@water.ca.gov

